DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 431 UD 029 366

AUTHOR Chamberlain, Ed
TITLE Neglected or Delinquent Program, 1991-1992. Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Chapter 1. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, Ohio.
PUB DATE May 93
NOTE 22p.; For the 1990-91 report, see ED 343 991.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Neglect; *Compensatory Education; *Delinquency; Disadvantaged Youth; *Elementary School Students; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Federal Programs; High Risk Students; *Language Acquisition; Minority Groups; Program Evaluation; *Secondary School Students; Standardized Tests; Tutoring; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Columbus Public Schools OH; Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; Final Reports

ABSTRACT

The Neglected or Delinquent (N or D) Program of the Columbus (Ohio) public schools is designed to provide classroom and tutorial services in the area of language development for pupils served in Chapter 1 eligible facilities for the neglected or delinquent. In the 1991-92 school year, there was one full-time N or D teacher and 16 part-time tutors providing services in 12 institutions. Standardized test information for grades 2 through 12 was collected from September 1991 through April 1992. The data included results of norm-referenced tests, the Metropolitan Achievement Test, the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, and the California Achievement Tests. The program served a total of 371 students, most of whom were in grades 6 through 12. Of these, 144 were non-minority, 224 were Black, and 3 were Hispanic. There were 11 females and 260 males. No assessment could be made of the desired outcome of a defined achievement gain because of high pupil mobility. Program continuation is recommended because it provides needed services in exceptional circumstances. An alternative evaluation design is recommended, since too few pupils are enrolled long enough to fulfill the current plan. Four tables present study findings. An appendix contains worksheets, a data sheet, and evaluation forms. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED360431

Elementary and Secondary Education Act - Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM

1991 - 1992

Written by:
Ed Chamberlain
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of:

E. Jane Williams, Ph.D.

Data Analysis by:

Kathy Morgan
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of:

Richard A. Amorose, Ph.D.

Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools
Department of Program Evaluation
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. Thompson
Columbus Public Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

P:\PS05\RPTFNC92
5-21-93 8:53 AM

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Elementary and Secondary Education Act - Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM
1991-92

ABSTRACT

Program Description: The Neglected or Delinquent Program (N or D) is designed to provide classroom and tutorial services in the area of language development for pupils served in Chapter 1 eligible facilities for the neglected or delinquent. During the 1991-92 school year, there was one full-time N or D reading teacher and 16 part-time tutors providing services in 12 institutions. In terms of full-time equivalency, the program was served by 3.95 teachers.

Time Interval: For purposes of evaluating standardized achievement test information (grades 2-12), data were collected for the period from September 16, 1991, through April 3, 1992. This interval of time provided 141 possible days for instruction. Additional Enrollment/Attendance data were collected for grade 1 pupils through May 1, 1992, an additional 14 possible days.

Desired Outcome: Desired Outcome 1(a) (for grades 2-12) stated that at least 50% of the pupils in the sample--those who met the attendance criterion, were English speaking, and had a pretest-posttest score for Reading Comprehension--would gain at least 3.0 Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period. Desired Outcome 1(b) (for grade 1) was that at least 50% of the pupils in the treatment group--those who met the attendance criterion and were English speaking--would reach an appropriate text Reading level for promotion to grade 2.

Evaluation Design: Norm-referenced tests were administered in grades 2-12 in a spring-to-spring cycle. Grade 2 pupils received the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Sixth Edition (MAT6). Grades 3-8 received the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS, 1981) in the spring of 1991 and the California Achievement Tests (CAT, 1985) in the spring of 1992. All CTBS scores were converted to equivalent CAT scores, using tables furnished by the publisher. The instrument for determining text reading level in grade 1 was a locally-developed criterion-referenced oral reading test.

Major Findings: The program served a total of 371 pupils for an average of 1.3 hours of instruction per week. Of the pupils served, 33 were in grades 1 through 5, and 338 were in grades 6 through 12. The average daily membership was 52.1. The average days of enrollment per pupil was 12.9 and the average days of attendance per pupil was 9.9. There was a high degree of pupil mobility due to varying lengths of time pupils were assigned to the institutional facilities served.

Of the 371 pupils served in the program, 111 were girls and 260 were boys. In regard to ethnic origin, 144 pupils were non-minority, 224 were Black, and three were Hispanic. The percent of minority pupils served was 61.2.

Due to a high degree of pupil mobility, only three pupils in grades 2-12, and no pupils in grade 1, had attended enough days for inclusion in the evaluation sample/treatment group. However none of the three pupils who met the attendance criterion had complete test data (pretest and posttest). Therefore no assessment could be made based on the program's Desired Outcomes.

Recommendations: It is recommended that the N or D Program be continued, since it provides a needed service to pupils in exceptional circumstances. It is further recommended that alternatives to the present evaluation design be considered. Only a limited number of pupils are enrolled in the program long enough to attain the criteria for inclusion in the evaluation sample or treatment group. The value of testing under these circumstances would seem questionable.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act - Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM

1991-1992

Program Evaluation

The Neglected or Delinquent Program (N or D) is designed to provide classroom and tutorial services in the area of language development for pupils served in Chapter 1 eligible facilities for the neglected or delinquent. The N or D Component became a separate entity under ESEA Title I in the 1968-69 school year, at which time emphasis was placed on providing intensive service to pupils residing in institutions.

During the 1991-92 school year, the program operated in 12 institutions and was staffed by one full time N or D reading teacher and 16 part-time tutoring positions. In terms of full-time equivalency, the program was served by 3.95 teachers. The term "teachers" will be used in this report to designate providers of instruction, whether in a small group or a tutorial setting. The institutions in which services occurred were: Rosemont School, Another Chance, Family Times Group Home, Franklin County Juvenile Detention Center, Hampton Group Home, Hannah Neil Center, Joyce Avenue Group Home, Karl Road Group Home, Neil Avenue Group Home, Parenthesis Family Advocates, Whittier Group Home, and Youth Advocate Services.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation design incorporated two Desired Outcomes. The program's Desired Outcomes were as follows:

Desired Outcome 1(a): At least 50 percent of the pupils (grades 2-8) in the evaluation sample will gain at least 3.0 normal curve equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period in reading comprehension. Gain will be measured by a nationally standardized achievement test. The evaluation sample is defined as those pupils who attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period.

Desired Outcome 1(b): At least 50 percent of the grade 1 pupils in the treatment group will reach an appropriate text reading level for promotion to grade 2. The appropriate Scott Foresman text reading level for the end of grade 1 is successful completion of reading level 8 (3rd preprimer). The treatment group is defined as those pupils who attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period.

In addition to data related to total reading as specified in the Desired Outcome, data were also collected on reading comprehension. This was done since federal guidelines require that aggregate test data be reported for grades 2 and above for both Total Reading and Reading Comprehension for individual buildings. For purposes of evaluating achievement test data (grades 2-12), the instructional period was considered to be the period from September 16, 1991, through April 3, 1992. This interval of time provided 141 possible days for instruction. For purposes of assessing text reading level (grade 1), the instructional period was considered to be the period from September 23, 1991, through May 1, 1992. This period provided 155 possible days of instruction. Since N or D tutoring activities are not bound by the calendar of the Columbus Public Schools, the possible days of instruction as stated here include a number of days when the Columbus Public Schools was not in session. The maximum possible days of instruction does

not necessarily define the actual treatment periods. Treatment periods varied according to the service patterns of program teachers.

Instruments

Data were collected in three areas. Copies of the instruments used to collect data are found in the Appendix, with the exception of the standardized achievement tests.

1. Pupil Census Instruments

Calendar Worksheet for Recording Days of Pupil Service. The Calendar Worksheet was used to help program teachers collect program service data. A Calendar Worksheet was kept for each pupil. The form included the following information: the pupil's name, birthdate, student number, ethnic or race code, sex, grade, and hours of instruction scheduled per week. Days of instruction scheduled and served were recorded by program teachers so that correct information was available to report at the end of the year on the Pupil Data Sheet. Copies of the Calendar Worksheets were collected at regular intervals in order to maintain a master file of Chapter 1 pupils served in facilities other than those provided by the school system. Different versions of the Calendar Worksheet were used for grade 1 and grades 2-12. Both versions of the Calendar Worksheet are found in the Appendix, pages 10-11.

Pupil Data Sheet. The Pupil Data Sheet was developed to help program teachers summarize the pupil information from the Calendar Worksheet. This instrument was used to collect the following information: data identifying those pupils who were non-English speaking, subjective ratings of pupil progress given by teachers, the number of hours of instruction per week, number of days scheduled for instruction, and number of days service received. Days scheduled and days of instruction were specified for the period from September 16, 1991 through April 3, 1992 (grades 2-12), and from September 23, 1991 through May 1, 1992 (grade 1). The attendance criteria for the Desired Outcomes were applied to these time periods. A copy of the Pupil Data Sheet is found in the Appendix, page 12.

2. Standardized Achievement Test Instruments

Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS, 1981). Except at grades 1 and 2, program pupils were administered the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS, 1981) in the spring of 1991 as a pretest. This test series, which is published by CTB/McGraw-Hill, has empirical norms for fall and spring, established October 6-10, 1980, and April 27 to May 1, 1981.

California Achievement Tests (CAT, 1985). The California Achievement Tests were administered to program pupils in grades 3-12 in Spring 1992 as a posttest. This test series, which is also published by CTB/McGraw-Hill, has empirical norms for fall and spring, established in the fall of 1984 and the spring of 1985.

Metropolitan Achievement Tests Sixth Edition (MAT6, 1985). Second-grade pupils were administered the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Sixth edition (MAT6, 1985), which is published by the Psychological Corporation/Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. This test series has two sets of norms (national and nonpublic) for fall and spring. Standardization was established between October 1 and 31 in 1984 for fall, and spring standardization was established between April 8 and May 15 in 1985.

All testing was done on level using the Norm-Referenced Model for evaluation of the Chapter 1 N or D Program. A spring-to-spring testing cycle was used for grades 2-12. The form, subtest, and test levels used for each grade level are shown in Table 1. All CTBS pretest scores were converted to equivalent CAT scores, using tables furnished by the publisher.

Table 1

Table of Standardized Achievement Measures
for Chapter 1 N or D Program
1991-92

Program Component	Grade	Pretest				Posttest			
		Test	Level	Form	Subtest(s)	Test	Level	Form	Subtest(s)
		Spring 1991				Spring 1992			
Elementary School Reading (Grades 2-5)	2	MAT6	PR	L	Total Reading	MAT6	P1	L	Total Reading
	3	CTBS	D	V	Total Reading	CAT	13	E	Total Reading
	4	CTBS	E	V	Total Reading	CAT	14	E	Total Reading
	5	CTBS	F	V	Total Reading	CAT	15	E	Total Reading
Middle School Reading (Grades 6-8)	6	CTBS	G	V	Total Reading	CAT	16	E	Total Reading
	7	CTBS	G	V	Total Reading	CAT	17	E	Total Reading
	8	CTBS	H	V	Total Reading	CAT	18	E	Total Reading
High School Reading (Grades 9-12)	9-12	CTBS	J	V	Total Reading	CAT	19	E	Total Reading

Note. The MAT6 Total Reading score includes the Vocabulary, Word Recognition, and Reading Comprehension Subtests.
The CTBS and the CAT Total Reading Scores include the Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension subtests.

P:\P505\TBLFND92
5-21-93 1:06 PM

Many pupils served in institutions for the neglected and delinquent also attended schools in the Columbus Public Schools. Where this was the case pupils in grades 2-10 were tested in their regular classrooms as part of Districtwide Testing. Pupils in grades 11 and 12, and pupils not attending a Columbus Public School, were tested by their program teachers.

3. Inservice Evaluation Instrument

Orientation Inservice Evaluation Form. This locally developed instrument was designed to obtain teacher perceptions regarding the Orientation inservice session, which was held September 19, 1991. An abbreviated version of the instrument, the General Inservice Evaluation Form, was used at a Chapter 1 inservice meeting regarding Responses to Literature, which was held March 5, 1992, and was attended by one of the N or D teachers. The two instruments used for inservice evaluation are found in the Appendix, pages 13-15. While the evaluation design does not provide for the collection of these data (nor are the findings reported here), interim inservice evaluation reports for the two meetings were forwarded to Federal and State Programs, where they are available on request.

Major Findings

Pupil Census Information

A total of 371 pupils in institutions was served by the ESEA Chapter 1 N or D Program during the 1991-92 school year for an average of 1.3 hours of instruction per week. Of the pupils served, 33 were in grades 1 through 5, and 338 were in grades 6 through 12. The average daily membership in the program was 52.1. In grade 1 (scheduled from September 23, 1991 through May 1, 1992) the average days of enrollment per pupil was 37.6 while the average days of attendance per pupil was 29.6. In grades 2-12 (scheduled from September 16, 1991 through April 3, 1992) the average days of enrollment per pupil was 12.6 and the average days of attendance per pupil was 9.6. The overall average days for all pupils, without regard to dates of service, was 12.9 days of enrollment and 9.9 days of attendance. Data pertaining to enrollment and attendance are presented in Table 2.

Of the 371 pupils served in the program, 111 were girls and 260 were boys. In regard to ethnic origin, 144 pupils were non-minority, 224 were Black, and three were Hispanic. The percent of minority pupils served was 61.2%. Table 3 contains data on ethnic origin of pupils served.

Pupils were served in 12 institutions by one full-time N or D reading teacher and 16 tutors working on a part-time basis. Both full-time and tutorial instructors are referred to as teachers in this report. The average number of pupils served by each of the 17 teachers during the school year was 21.8, with the average number of pupils per teacher at any given time being 3.1 based on average daily membership. The pupil-teacher ratio based on average daily membership divided by teacher full-time equivalency was 13.2. There was a high degree of pupil mobility due to the varying lengths of time pupils were assigned to the institutional facilities served.

Pupil census information also included teacher subjective ratings of pupil progress as pupils exited the program. Of the 371 pupils served in the program, 22 (5.9%) were rated by their program teachers as making much progress, 298 (80.3%) as making some progress, and 51 (13.7%) as making no progress. For progress ratings by grade see Table 4.

Table 2

Number of Pupils Served and Averages for Days of Enrollment, Days of Attendance, Daily Membership and Hours of Instruction Per Week Reported by Grade Level for N or D Programs
1991-92

	Pupils Served			Average			
Grade	N	Girls	Boys	Days of Enrollment	Days of Attendance	Daily Membership	Hours of Instruction per Pupil per Week
1	5	2	3	37.6	29.6	1.8	2.1
2	5	0	5	36.4	32.8	1.8	1.6
3	5	0	5	50.8	42.8	2.9	3.9
4	12	1	11	31.5	28.4	3.7	1.9
5	6	1	5	19.7	17.2	1.4	1.4
6	12	6	6	18.5	12.8	2.2	1.5
7	43	15	28	16.8	12.4	5.8	1.7
8	48	17	31	10.9	7.4	5.7	1.4
9	94	23	71	8.6	6.4	10.0	1.3
10	100	35	65	10.1	7.2	11.9	0.9
11	33	10	23	9.7	7.9	3.6	1.5
12	8	1	7	9.4	7.6	1.3	0.8
Total	371	111	260	12.9	9.9	52.1	1.3

P:\P505\RPTFND92
5-21-93 8:53 AM

Table 3

Number of Pupils Served by Ethnic Origin and
Percent of Minority Pupils Reported by
Grade Level for N or D Program
1991-92

Grade	Pupils Served	Non-Minority	Black	Spanish	Oriental	American Indian	Percent Minority Pupils
1	5	3	2	0	0	0	40.0
2	5	2	3	0	0	0	60.0
3	5	1	4	0	0	0	80.0
4	12	4	8	0	0	0	66.7
5	6	4	2	0	0	0	33.3
6	12	5	7	0	0	0	58.3
7	43	20	23	0	0	0	53.5
8	48	18	30	0	0	0	62.5
9	94	35	57	2	0	0	62.8
10	100	36	63	1	0	0	64.0
11	33	14	19	0	0	0	57.6
12	8	2	6	0	0	0	75.0
Total	371	144	224	3	0	0	61.2

P:\P505\RPTFND92
5-21-93 8:53 AM

Table 4

Progress of N or D Program Pupils as Rated
by Program Teachers
by Grade Level
1991-92

Grade	Pupils Served	Descriptors of Amount of Progress					
		Much		Some		None	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
1	5	0	0.0	3	60.0	2	40.0
2	5	0	0.0	4	80.0	1	20.0
3	5	0	0.0	5	100.0	0	0.0
4	12	0	0.0	10	83.3	2	16.7
5	6	0	0.0	5	83.3	1	16.7
6	12	0	0.0	10	83.3	2	16.7
7	43	3	7.0	36	83.7	4	9.3
8	48	1	2.1	40	83.3	7	14.6
9	94	6	6.4	80	85.1	8	8.5
10	100	11	11.0	70	70.0	19	19.0
11	33	0	0.0	29	87.9	4	12.1
12	8	1	12.5	6	75.0	1	12.5
Total	371	22	5.9	298	80.3	51	13.7

Standardized Achievement Test Information

Standardized Achievement test data were of two types. Reading Comprehension scores were used to assess Desired Outcome 1(a): that at least 50 percent of the pupils (grades 2-12) in the evaluation sample gain at least 3.0 NCE points for the instructional period. In addition, aggregate scores were obtained for both Total Reading and Reading Comprehension. Federal guidelines require that aggregate test data be reported for grade 2 and above for both Total Reading (Basic Skills) and Reading Comprehension (Advanced Skills) for individual buildings.

In order to be in the evaluation sample pupils had to be English speaking, meet the attendance criterion (80% of the days scheduled for instruction) and have both a pretest and a posttest score. In addition, pupils who were eligible for Special Education were exempted from testing since their test scores would not be considered valid.

Of the 371 pupils served in the program, all but one were English speaking. Fifty-six pupils were exempted from testing due to their Special Education status. In this year's program only three pupils met the attendance criterion, and none of these three pupils had both a pretest and posttest score. Therefore it was not possible to evaluate the program in terms of norm-referenced test data.

Text Reading Level Information

Desired Outcome 1(b) stated that at least 50 percent of the grade 1 pupils in the treatment group will reach an appropriate text reading level for promotion to grade 2. The appropriate Scott Foresman text reading level for the end of grade 1 is successful completion of reading level 8 (3rd preprimer). Reading level was determined by an oral reading test administered by coordinators from Federal and State Programs. In order to be in the treatment sample pupils had to be English speaking and meet the attendance criterion (80% of the days scheduled for instruction). Pupils who were eligible for Special Education were exempted from testing because their scores would not be considered valid. Of the five pupils in grade 1, four were eligible for Special Education and none of the five pupils had been served enough days for inclusion in the treatment group. Therefore no data are available for Desired Outcome 1(b).

Summary/Recommendations

The program provided instructional services to 371 pupils served by 17 teachers in 12 institutions for the neglected or delinquent. The average daily membership was 52.1. There was considerable turnover in pupil enrollment during the year, as is normal in N or D facilities. The average days of enrollment per pupil was 12.9 days, and the average days of attendance was 9.9.

The Desired Outcome for grades 2-12 stated that at least 50 percent of the pupils in the evaluation sample (those pupils who had a valid pretest and posttest measure, attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period, and were English speaking) would gain at least 3.0 normal curve equivalent (NCE) points for the instructional period in Reading Comprehension, as measured by a nationally standardized achievement test. One pupil was non-English speaking and 56 pupils were exempted from testing due to their Special Education Status. There were no pupils who both met the attendance criterion and had a valid pretest and posttest score. Therefore there was no evaluation sample for this Desired Outcome.

The Desired Outcome for grade 1 stated that at least 50 percent of the grade 1 pupils in the treatment group will reach an appropriate text reading level for promotion to grade 2. The appropriate Scott Forsman text reading level for the end of grade 1 is successful completion of reading level 8 (3rd preprimer). Reading level was to be determined by an oral reading test administered by coordinators from Federal and State Programs. The treatment group is defined as those pupils who attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period. Of the five pupils in grade 1, four were exempt from testing due to their Special Education status. However there were no pupils in grade 1 who had been served enough days for inclusion in the treatment group. Therefore no evaluative data were available for this Desired Outcome.

It is recommended that the N or D Program be continued, since it provides a needed service to pupils in exceptional circumstances. It is further recommended that alternatives to the present evaluation design be considered. Only a limited number of pupils are enrolled in the program long enough to satisfy attendance criteria for inclusion in the evaluation sample or treatment group. In addition, many pupils are exempt from testing due to their special education status. The value of testing under these circumstances would seem questionable.

Appendix

NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT (N or D) PROGRAM

* CALENDAR WORKSHEET FOR RECORDING DAYS OF PUPIL SERVICE *

1991-92

(Grades 2-12)

Student's Name _____

Student's Birthdate _ _ _ _ _ _ (M M D D Y Y)

Student Number _ _ _ _ _ _

Pace Code _____ (1-5) Sex _____ (M or F) Hours Scheduled Per Week _____

Note: Please keep original worksheets for all pupils (even for pupils who leave). Do not send to program coordinator or to other schools.

Teacher Name _____

Program Code 9 2 0 6 0

Grade Level _ _

N or D Facility _____

Public School Attended _____

Public School Code _ _ _

Office Use Only: ____

1991-92	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	Schdl. (1, 2)	Served (2)
Aug. 26 - Sept. 20	M	M	28	29	30	H	3	4	5	6	9	10	11	12	13	16	17	18	19	20		
(Max. schdl. days=05)	0	0				0																
Sept. 23 - Oct. 18	23	24	25	26	27	30	1	2	3	4	7	8	9	10	11	14	15	16	17	18		
(Max. schdl. days=20)																						
Oct. 21 - Nov. 15	21	22	23	24	25	28	29	30	31	1	4	5	6	7	8	11	12	13	14	15		
(Max. schdl. days=20)																						
Nov. 18 - Dec. 13	18	19	20	21	22	25	26	27	H	29	2	3	4	5	6	9	10	11	12	13		
(Max. schdl. days=19)									0													
Dec. 16 - Jan. 10	16	17	18	19	20	23	24	H	26	27	30	31	H	2	3	6	7	8	9	10		
(Max. schdl. days=18)								0					0									
Jan. 13 - Feb. 7	13	14	15	16	17	H	21	22	23	24	27	28	29	30	31	3	4	5	6	7		
(Max. schdl. days=19)						0																
Feb. 10 - Mar. 6	10	11	12	13	14	17	18	19	20	21	24	25	26	27	28	2	3	4	5	6		
(Max. schdl. days=20)																						
Mar. 9 - Apr. 3	9	10	11	12	13	16	17	18	19	20	23	24	25	26	27	30	31	1	2	3		
(Max. schdl. days=20)																						
Apr. 6 - May 1	6	7	8	9	10	13	14	15	16	N	20	21	22	23	24	27	28	29	30	1	////////	////////
(No scheduled days)	<——Spring Test——>									0											\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\
May 4 - May 29	4	5	6	7	8	11	12	13	14	15	18	19	20	21	22	H	26	27	28	29	////////	////////
(No scheduled days)																0					\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\
June 1 - June 26	1	2	3	4	5	8	9	10	11	12	15	16	17	18	19	22	23	24	25	26	////////	////////
(No scheduled days)						0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\

RACE and/or ETHNIC CODES:

1 = Non Minority
2 = Black
3 = Spanish Surname
4 = Asian American
5 = American Indian

SERVICE CODES

0 = Pupil Not Scheduled (Inservice, Teacher Illness, Personal Day, Snow Day, Parent Conference Day, etc.)
1 = Pupil Scheduled and Not Served (Absent from School/Class)
2 = Pupil Served (Pupil present)

ALPHABETIC CODES

(Write Codes to **Left** of Date—Not in Service Code Field)
E = Entered
W = Withdrawn

TOTALS	
Schdl.	Served

(Maximum Scheduled = 141)
(Maximum Served = 141)

EVALSRVCS/P505/ORIENN092

NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT (N or D) PROGRAM
* CALENDAR WORKSHEET FOR RECORDING DAYS OF PUPIL SERVICE *
1991-92

Student's Name _____

Student's Birthdate: _____ (M M D D Y Y)

Student Number _ _ _ _ _ _

Race Code _____ (1-5) Sex _____ (M or F)

Note: Please keep original worksheets for all pupils (even for pupils who leave). Do not send to program coordinator or to other schools.

Grade Level 0 1

Public School Attended _____

Hours Scheduled Per Week _____

Teacher Name _____

Program Code 9 2 0 6 0

N or D Facility _____

Public School Code _ _ _

Office Use Only: ____

1991-92	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	Schdl. (1, 2)	Served (2)
Aug. 26 - Sept. 20	M	M	28	29	30	H	3	4	5	6	9	10	11	12	13	16	17	18	19	20	//////////	
(No scheduled days)	0	0				0										<——Fall Test——>					\\\\\\\\\\	
Sept. 23 - Oct. 18	23	24	25	26	27	30	1	2	3	4	7	8	9	10	11	14	15	16	17	18		
(Max. schdl. days=20)																						
Oct. 21 - Nov. 15	21	22	23	24	25	28	29	30	31	1	4	5	6	7	8	11	12	13	14	15		
(Max. schdl. days=20)																						
Nov. 18 - Dec. 13	18	19	20	21	22	25	26	27	H	29	2	3	4	5	6	9	10	11	12	13		
(Max. schdl. days=19)									0													
Dec. 16 - Jan. 10	16	17	18	19	20	23	24	H	26	27	30	31	H	2	3	6	7	8	9	10		
(Max. schdl. days=18)								0					0									
Jan. 13 - Feb. 7	13	14	15	16	17	H	21	22	23	24	27	28	29	30	31	3	4	5	6	7		
(Max. schdl. days=19)						0																
Feb. 10 - Mar. 6	10	11	12	13	14	17	18	19	20	21	24	25	26	27	28	2	3	4	5	6		
(Max. schdl. days=20)																						
Mar. 9 - Apr. 3	9	10	11	12	13	16	17	18	19	20	23	24	25	26	27	30	31	1	2	3		
(Max. schdl. days=20)																						
Apr. 6 - May 1	6	7	8	9	10	13	14	15	16	N	20	21	22	23	24	27	28	29	30	1		
(Max. schdl. days=19)	<——Spring Test——>									0												
May 4 - May 29	4	5	6	7	8	11	12	13	14	15	18	19	20	21	22	H	26	27	28	29	//////////	
(No scheduled days)																0					\\\\\\\\\\	
June 1 - June 26	1	2	3	4	5	8	9	10	11	12	15	16	17	18	19	22	23	24	25	26	//////////	
(No scheduled days)						0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\\\\\\\\\\	

RACE and/or ETHNIC CODES:
1 = Non Minority
2 = Black
3 = Spanish Surname
4 = Asian American
5 = American Indian

SERVICE CODES
0 = Pupil Not Scheduled (Inservice, Teacher Illness, Personal Day, Snow Day, Parent Conference Day, etc.)
1 = Pupil Scheduled and Not Served (Absent from School/Class)
2 = Pupil Served (Pupil present)

ALPHABETIC CODES
(Write Codes to Left of Date—Not in Service Code Fields)
E = Entered
W = Withdrawn

TOTALS	
Schdl.	Served

(Maximum Scheduled = 155)
(Maximum Served = 155)

Columbus Public Schools
Compensatory Education Programs

April 16, 1992
9:10

SHEET 1

PUPIL DATA SHEET

SCHOOL CODE _ _ _ PROGRAM CODE _ _ _ _ _ _ SSN _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

SCHOOL NAME _____ PROGRAM NAME _____ TEACHER NAME _____

1. STUDENT NAME _

2. STUDENT NO. _ _ _ _ _ _ _ GRADE _ _ BIRTHDATE _ _ / _ _ / _ _

3. PUPIL PROGRESS NONE SOME MUCH

4. HOURS PER WEEK OF INSTRUCTION | | | | | |

5. IS THIS PUPIL ENGLISH SPEAKING? NO YES

	GRADES 2-12:	GRADE 1 ONLY:
	THRU 04-03-92	THRU 05-01-92
6. NUMBER OF DAYS SERVICE SCHEDULED (CAREFULLY READ INSTRUCTIONS)		
7. NUMBER OF DAYS SERVICE RECEIVED (CAREFULLY READ INSTRUCTIONS)		

8. SCOTT FORESMAN TEXT READING LEVEL (CAREFULLY READ INSTRUCTIONS) | | | |

9. ON AVERAGE THIS PUPIL WAS SCHEDULED TO RECEIVE SERVICE

_____ DAYS OUT OF _____.

Prepared by
Office of the Deputy Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation

ESEA CHAPTER 1 AND DPPF
ORIENTATION INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1992-93 ORIENTATION

Date of Orientation Meeting _____ A.M. ___ P.M. ___ ALL DAY ___

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ESEA Chapter 1 Programs:
- (1) Reading-Elementary (1-5)
- (2) Mathematics-Elementary (3-5)
- (3) Reading-Middle School (6-8)
- (4) Mathematics-Middle School (6-8)
- (5) N or D (1-12)
- (6) Nonpublic (1-8)
- (7) Reading Recovery (1)
- (8) Early Literacy (1-2)

DPPF Programs:
- (9) Instructional Assistant - K
- (10) ADK
- (11) Early Literacy - 2

General Fund Program:
- (12) HSCA/SSS

Other (Specify)
- (13) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree with statements 1-4, in rating the overall day of inservice.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile inservice.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this inservice will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentations.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

Circle the number that indicates how you would rate each of the following portions of today's inservice in regard to interest and usefulness of presentations.

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
5. Program Coordinators' Presentation					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1
6. Program Evaluation Presentation					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1

Please turn over for questions 7-9

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7. What was the most valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

8. What was the least valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

9. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings?

_____

_____

_____

GENERAL INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1991-92

Inservice Topic: _____

Presenter(s): _____

Date: ____/____/____ (e.g., 03/05/92)
MM DD YY

Session (Check only one): _____ all day _____ a.m. _____p.m. _____ after school

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ESEA Chapter 2 Program:
(l) FDK

ESEA Chapter 1 Programs:
(2) ADK
(3) Reading-Elementary (2-5)
(4) Mathematics-Elementary (3-5)
(5) Reading-Middle School (6-8)
(6) Mathematics-Middle School (6-8)
(7) N or D (1-12)
(8) Nonpublic (1-8)
(9) Reading Recovery (1)
(l0) Chap. 1 Early Literacy (1-2)

DPPF Programs:
(11) Instructional Assistant - K
(12) Instructional Assistant - 1
(13) Early Literacy (2)

Other (Specify)
(14) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with statements 1-4.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this meeting will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

5. What was the most valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

6. What was the least valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

7. Please list any additional information or topics you would like to see covered in future meetings.

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____